

GMH SITE PLAN & SUBDIVISION (02-16, 17 & 18)

Mr. Jim Sperry appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. SPERRY: Jim Sperry, BL Companies.

MR. PETRO: This project involves subdivision of 69.78 plus or minus acre parcel into two lots. This is the subdivision we're looking at first.

MR. SPERRY: Exactly.

MR. PETRO: Parcel into two lots associated with the proposed multi-family development. This was previously reviewed at the 26 June, 2002, 9 October, 2002, 11 December, 2002 planning board meetings. All right, Jim?

MR. SPERRY: I think I'm going to be very brief tonight on all three of these, in fact, on the subdivision, I don't believe we had any comments of any significance at all last meeting and in the public hearing so I'm just going to open it up for any questions that the board may have written up.

MR. PETRO: We've seen this is the fourth time I believe Mark you don't have anything further on this right as far as--

MR. EDSALL: No, just the review of the final plan for stamping but it's all the issues I believe have been addressed.

MR. PETRO: And I think that we can move forward with this, I don't see this as a problem.

MR. EDSALL: No, I think it's your option. One thing you have to do before you can move forward on any approval tonight or any future time is we have to get SEQRA out of the way. Are you inclined to deal with that tonight?

MR. PETRO: Yes.

MR. EDSALL: Okay, as you're aware, the subdivision and the two associated site plans the board considered as a single action under SEQRA rather than doing the evil deed of segmenting the review. So you have incorporated it all into a single environmental review, the board from their review acknowledged that it could be considered a Type I action because of the total number of units but there's the curve ball that there are existing units out there and if you stay the existing units and subtract those from the proposed number of units, the resultant new units don't exceed the threshold. But to be conservative, the board treated it as if it was a Type I and did a very thorough review and subsequent to receiving a full EAF, you also asked for drainage studies and a separate traffic study. The traffic study was the only open issue of any significance. There was one submitted, we had comments, we returned comments back to the applicant, they have resubmitted, that's been reviewed by Phil Greely who is the traffic specialist who we brought on board, that's now been all resolved. And to cut to the chase, the bottom line determination is that this board's requirement that Clark Street extension was needed was reflected in the traffic study as being mandatory, if that's not included, it creates an unacceptable level of service out on 207, so we should keep that in mind when First Columbia comes back, that crossconnection between the Clark Street extension with the alternate access through the First Columbia parcel is a critical item and we're all aware of it. But the traffic study supported the chairman's initial beliefs so that's a, it's a good thing that you included that. With that in mind, all the issues that were raised have been addressed and attached to my comments for the subdivision is a negative declaration which was prepared in cooperation with the applicant's attorney. If you want to take a look through that and then consider adopting that, it would be appropriate, I believe.

MR. PETRO: Okay, when we adopt this, my question then would be it's for all three parcels?

MR. EDSALL: Covers all three applications which under SEQRA is considered one action.

MR. PETRO: We can do this at this time under the subdivision portion of it, we don't have to wait for the site plans?

MR. EDSALL: We'd adopt it and acknowledge that it covers all three applications.

MR. PETRO: Any members have any problems with that or additions or subtractions to any of this? I think Mark's gone over it pretty thoroughly along with the applicant. I'm certainly ready to adopt it if we have a motion.

MR. LANDER: So moved.

MR. KARNAVEZOS: Second it.

MR. PETRO: Motion has been made and seconded that the New Windsor Planning Board adopt the negative declaration that's been prepared by the applicant and by Mark Edsall as written. Is there any additions, subtractions or any changes to this by any of the members? We already know that Mark finds it acceptable, if there isn't any, I don't hear any, I will do a roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. KARNAVEZOS	AYE
MR. LANDER	AYE
MR. PETRO	AYE

MR. PETRO: That's for all three portions of this application. All right, we've seen this subdivision a number of times, it's a minor subdivision, and I think it's ready to go, so I think with this one tonight we can grant final approval to the GMH Stewart Terrace minor subdivision.

MR. LANDER: So moved.

MR. KARNAVEZOS: Second it.

MR. PETRO: Motion has been made and seconded that the

New Windsor Planning Board grant final approval to the GMH Stewart Terrace minor subdivision Clark Street which is off Route 207. Is there any further discussion from any of the board members? If not, roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. KARNAVEZOS	AYE
MR. LANDER	AYE
MR. PETRO	AYE

MR. PETRO: Jim, I think you're up next.

MR. SPERRY: I'll be thorough again, very quickly on the site plans and just comment that there were numerous clean-up type comments I think after our last meeting and review by Mark Edsall and we have addressed those and I think Mark can certainly comment on the level of that. There are perhaps some minor housekeeping items that we still have to address as we just close the final plan and additionally, any concerns that came out in the public hearing for both the site plans we have addressed those. We have letters that document, for example, the water and sewer capacity so all those issues that were brought up in the last meeting were addressed. First plan is P1, the lot 1 for the market rate and one of the primary concerns was revisiting the parking layout which we did and we adjusted the layout I think of the parking areas and how each of the buildings spoke to that and other than that, just some very, very minor utility comments so open it up for questions again.

MR. PETRO: I know it's covered in the statement that we just adopted but go over the downstream drainage for me one more time, I just want to get a good idea how the water and where it's going.

MR. SPERRY: Let me take you, if I can, both lot 1 and 2 just so you understand and it's a little easy to see I'll start really here, you've got two watershed areas on the site, what we call the upper terrace which is part of lot 2 and all of this actually drains up into the corner over here and right now, there's just a

discharge point where it moves down into a swale off the site, with no means at all for a storm water management. Again, it's a collection system within the street. On lot 2, excuse me, the lower portion of lot 2, this water all drains towards the lower portion of the site right now and let me go to lot 1, explain where that ends up going, again, it's in-street collection system right now located within this area and also throughout the existing roadway section in lot 1, all of which then has direct discharge into the adjoining stream. I believe there's four or five locations and you've got like 1, 2, 3, 4, possibly a 5th and these are pipes again that just directly discharge into the stream. Right now, our plan first we've looked at the system, we have evaluated pipe sizes, identified where pipes have to be replaced and increased in size and we have also brought into lot 1 significant detention area that's going to be shown on the grading plan but really runs all the way through this area where the water comes in, it collects into that and we're doing what's called a first flush treatment for water quality and a limited amount of detention so we're actually creating the situation now where there's some control outflow that does not exist now.

MR. PETRO: You said four or five, is there four or five?

MR. SPERRY: I think there's four of them that had been identified, I think there was a question that there might be a fifth one that nobody can find because of the fact that the wall over in this area.

MR. PETRO: Obviously, it will function without that.

MR. SPERRY: Exactly.

MR. PETRO: Did you ever find a name for the stream.

MR. SPERRY: Yes, it's Gillick (phonetic) and it's on our plan, by the way.

MR. PETRO: The outflow you're telling me it's controlled through the detention basin, it's going to

be actually probably better than it is at this point.

MR. SPERRY: Absolutely, that's both quantity and quality, the most significant thing is that there's absolutely no control for either one right now.

MR. PETRO: You have upsized some of the interior drainage systems, I know some are smaller.

MR. SPERRY: We have both for size, condition and also location of the basins we have adjusted some and that's throughout both lot 1 on lot 2.

MR. PETRO: Last thing I'm going to bring up again is the road that's now the extension of Clark Street, Mark, before I go any further, Clark Street, is it a town road or isn't it? There was some discussion about that, again, Clark Street, the main portion I thought was a town road and we were because there was some discussion.

MR. SPERRY: It's not.

MR. EDSALL: I have heard both answers but last I heard was that it was not and to make it even clearer this application proposes that none of the roads be town roads.

MR. PETRO: So the extension is picking up off the private road, Clark Street?

MR. SPERRY: Right and we have a detail of that, by the way.

MR. PETRO: Twenty foot.

MR. SPERRY: Twenty 20 foot, we're increasing it, right now, it varies but we're increasing it so that it has a consistent 20 foot carriage way all the way through, we're adding guardrails and we're improving the shoulder of the road as well so that it meets the current private road standards of the town.

MR. PETRO: But not impacting any of the wetlands, just straightening it out basically just already uneven?

MR. SPERRY: Correct, all the work is going to be done within the existing roadway.

MR. PETRO: Two way complete flow in and out of the property?

MR. SPERRY: Yes.

MR. LANDER: Now, how many buildings are existing there now military housing?

MR. SPERRY: 299 I believe is the current number.

MR. LANDER: They're still occupied?

MR. SPERRY: In different stages of being occupied now, yes.

MR. LANDER: And the plan is after the lease is up in 50 years it will revert to the government?

MR. SPERRY: Exactly.

MR. LANDER: And the traffic study was, how is that going to impact the local community?

MR. SPERRY: What's interesting in the study--

MR. LANDER: Cause we have 299 but they're not exiting off the base, they were coming from housing onto the base.

MR. SPERRY: Exactly. What was interesting was that when we did that, first we looked at just the Clark Street and the impact right through there and comment came back the question was can we look at 207 and 300 and Drury Lane and 207 and as this is done in phases in the first couple of phases, it really has no impact at all, only when you get to a full built scenario to be conservative because the Drury Lane connector is in litigation, we opted to look at it in a no-build scenario, what if this is not built, what happens and we did, if we get to the full build of this project and the connector has not been constructed, we have to go

back and look at the activity on 300 because if we get all the activity in particular Clark Street going out onto 207, it's not going to create a problem on 207 itself but it's going to create more of a backup for people trying to get out on 207 and because of the, there will be the light at the Avenue of the Americas but to be conservative again to make sure we get traffic out of 207, the conclusion on it was that we may have to look at and do a deceleration lane into the project down just to move the traffic out of the free flow on 207. But that would only be something to look at not even guaranteed we need it but to look at it if we get to full build-out and Drury Lane still does not exist other than that as we look at the other intersections, even with the no-build, the conditions on the, for example, 300 and 207 really don't, there's no degradation to that due to the fact that so much of the traffic is already in the mix because of the project, the fact that these units have been there for so long and the increase is not so great.

MR. PETRO: I want to read comment number 2A, final review of the plans by the planning board engineer to determine that all corrections are included on the plans to be stamped. This should include a final evaluation on the adjustment or relocation of approximately 12 units to result in better parking distribution as well. The plan should identify and note that one of the units is an office, what's that all about?

MR. EDSALL: Well, as you recall, one of, as part of the site plan review, one of my concerns was that the parking, although the gross number may be adequate, that the distribution of the parking is consistent with the distribution of the housing units. And what I effectively did was took areas and looked at the total site and created almost pods of where parking lots that were near buildings and where the likely parking would occur for different units and there was one area that had quite an imbalance and I have come up with an idea of moving a couple units where the parking is and where the units may fit but I'm not aware of what other impacts may occur, it could live the way it is now but what I found may be an improvement so I'm suggesting



and we may have it resolved when they come back is to look at the alternative of moving four of the blocks as it may be which is three stories tall.

MR. PETRO: You're aware of this?

MR. SPERRY: We're aware and we agreed that we can do that because it doesn't, you may recall the way we designed it around the infrastructure roadway that's in there right now, so we don't have to impact anymore than necessary. That being said, utility infrastructure really gets in there, we're making improvements to it, but even moving some of the units is not going to have an impact on that if we have to adjust and move a unit, perhaps flip it.

MR. PETRO: This plan is not reflecting the change?

MR. EDSALL: Correct, we don't know if it will for sure work. The second issue on that that you discussed, Jim was just that as you recall was that of those units, one was on office and there's some cases where it's listing total number of units, but not indicating that one is an office. So I want the plans to be complete and consistent when you're ready to stamp them, I don't think either are significant issues but just final tune-ups to the plan.

MR. PETRO: So adjust that to either accommodate his new comment.

MR. SPERRY: We want to get what Mark's thoughts are and see if an adjustment can be made and if it makes sense we'll make it.

MR. EDSALL: Initially, I think the parking was more imbalanced, they did a real good job of moving things around creating new parking and it's very balanced now, just that one area that I'm concerned about.

MR. PETRO: Don't necessarily have to do it but you're going to explore the idea of doing it, see how it works out.

MR. SPERRY: Absolutely.

MR. PETRO: Anything else?

MR. SPERRY: No, unless there's any comments on lot 1 or 2, lot 2?

MR. PETRO: No, I don't have anything else. Mark, do you have anything else you want to add?

MR. EDSALL: No, as Jim said we started out with a very long list of concerns and comments and we boiled them down to just a couple so we're on the home stretch.

MR. KARNAVEZOS: The only comment I have was the back road that we were talking about as part of the traffic study, is that First Columbia's responsibility to redo North Jackson Avenue, is that where the traffic's going to come out of?

MR. PETRO: They don't have responsibility to do it at this time, it's coming out on there right now, it may be part of their plan but we're not requiring it as part of this application.

MR. KARNAVEZOS: I thought we needed two egresses to get--

MR. PETRO: We do here but it's already passable, they're going to bring it up to that point and what happens at that point we'll review when First Columbia gets to there.

MR. EDSALL: My concern is that when we get First Columbia in as part of their SEQRA document where they look at the overall plan, we have to ensure that that cross-connection doesn't go away and if anything it gets improved.

MR. SPERRY: You may recall we took LSI through, there was a provision made when we realigned the road and the intent was that the road that would pass LSI and comes over and connects into Jackson which allows any connection directly to Avenue of the Americas.

MR. EDSALL: It's a convenient alternate access.

February 26, 2003

18

MR. PETRO: Thank you.

MR. SPERRY: Thank you very much.